

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

204

CRM-M-42456 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: May 03, 2017

Inderjit Singh

....Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present: Mr. Navneet Singh Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Harpreet K. Athwal, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. S.K. Sandhir, Advocate
for the complainant.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J. (Oral)

This order shall dispose of the instant petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.88 dated 30.09.2016, under Sections 420, 120-B of Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Koom Kalan, District Ludhiana.

FIR came to be registered on the statement of Gurmail Singh. Allegations are against the agent namely Gurmukh Singh, Inderjit Singh (present petitioner) as also his daughter Navneet Kaur. It was alleged that the complainant was induced to pay a sum of ₹11,00,000 (eleven lacs) to Gurmukh Singh on the pretext that if son of the complainant namely Gurtinder Singh is married to Navneet Kaur, she would be in a position to settle Gurtinder Singh in Australia on the strength of her education qualifications.

Visa having been declined, Gurmukh Singh is stated to have returned approximately 50% of the amount. For the balance amount, Gurmukh Singh having approached this Court by filing separate petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C., the matter was referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court and an undertaking was recorded for part payment of the outstanding amount of ₹2,00,000 (two lacs) on or before 26.05.2017.

Further allegations are that upon the suggestion made by the present petitioner, a second attempt was made to secure visa upon payment of ₹7,95,000/- to a visa consultation firm. Even such attempt having failed, the amount in question is stated to have been transferred to the account of Navneet Kaur. Certain cash amount is stated to have been paid to the present petitioner also.

This Court vide order carrying even date has dealt with the petition seeking concession of pre-arrest bail to Navneet Kaur i.e. daughter of the present petitioner.

For the same very reason recorded in order dated 03.05.2017, passed in CRM-M-42257 of 2016, this Court is not inclined to extend in favour of the present petitioner the concession of pre-arrest bail.

Petition is dismissed.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

03.05.2017
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned : **Yes/No**
Whether reportable : **Yes/No**